

46 Am. Jur. 2d Judges § 25

American Jurisprudence, Second Edition | February 2022 Update

Judges

Glenda K. Harnad, J.D.; and Kristina E. Music Biro, J.D., of the staff of the National Legal Research Group, Inc.

V. Powers and Duties

A. In General

§ 25. Apportioning work among judges of court

[Topic Summary](#) | [Correlation Table](#) | [References](#)

West's Key Number Digest

West's Key Number Digest, [Judges](#)  [23](#), [24](#)

Forms

Forms relating to apportioning work load among judges, see Am. Jur. Pleading and Practice Forms, Judges [[Westlaw®\(r\)](#) [Search Query](#)]

Where a court is composed of several judges, the division of the work among them is a strictly judicial duty, and is an appropriate function of the office of chief justice of such court.¹

A statutory provision for the assignment by the chief justice of judges to hear particular cases or classes of cases does not contravene a constitutional provision that all judicial officers must be appointed by the governor.²

Subject only to the substantive law relating to the disqualification of judges, litigants have no right to have, or not have, any particular judge of a court hear their cause and have no due process right to be heard before any assignment or reassignment of the particular case to a particular judge; the assignment and reassignment of specific court cases between or among the judges of a multiple-judge court is a matter within the internal government of that court and a litigant does not have standing to enforce internal court policy with respect to the assignment of judges.³

Footnotes

- 1 [Ashley v. Wait](#), 228 Mass. 63, 116 N.E. 961, 8 A.L.R. 1463 (1917).
A commission issued by the chief justice assigning a district court judge to another district to hear a case was not required to contain a finding that the case was "exceptional" to be valid, and the assignment for "one day, or until the business is disposed of" did not authorize the judge to conduct only a one-day session of court but assigned the judge to the district until matters before the judge were concluded. [Lockert v. Lockert](#), 116 N.C. App. 73, 446 S.E.2d 606 (1994), writ allowed, 338 N.C. 311, 450 S.E.2d 490 (1994).
- 2 [Ketcham v. Lehner](#), 149 Vt. 314, 542 A.2d 290 (1988).
- 3 [Kruckenberg v. Powell](#), 422 So. 2d 994 (Fla. 5th DCA 1982).

End of Document

© 2022 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.